

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

-					ATTORNEY POOKET NO	COMPINALLERONAL	
P	PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/845,990		04/30/2001	John L. Levenda	John L. Levenda 38190/209224		
	826	7590	04/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER BOYD, JENNIFER A	
	ALSTON	& BIRD I	LLP		BOYD, JEN		
	BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA						
	101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

1771
DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\sim
Advisory Action	09/845,990	LEVENDA, JOHN L.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer A Boyd	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	ss
THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application appl	cation. A proper reply ich places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data.	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See	MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more arrived patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate exten- the final Office action; or (2)	sion fee under as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			:
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or sim	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims	.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	tion(s).		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	M	la Ruddock	· .
	Ula Pri	C. Ruddock mary Examiner	
S. Patent and Trademark Office		ch Center 1700 -	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's Arguments are not persuasive. The Examiner maintains all previously set forth rejections as detailed in paragraph 3 of the previous Office Action dated January 21, 2004. The Applicant's comments and arguments regarding the scope of the "consisting essentially of" language cannot take the place of evidence. It should be noted that the amendment dated October 1, 2003 simply states that the inclusion of a resin matrix would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics but did NOT state how. Additionally, the 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration is considered untimely.